W-02465A-09-0411 W-02465A-09-0414 W-20453A-09-0414 W-20454A-09-0414

W-20453A-09-0412 W-20454A-09-0413

ORIGINAL

ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMIS UTILITY COMPLAINT FORM



Investigator: Jenny Gomez

Phone:

Fax:

Priority: Respond Within Five Days

Opinion

No. 2010

87552

Date: 6/23/2010

Complaint Description:

08A Rate Case Items - Opposed

N/A Not Applicable

First:

Last:

Complaint By:

Nancy

Newman

Account Name:

Nancy Newman

Home: (000) 000-0000

Street:

Work:

City:

Tucson

CBR:

State:

ΑZ

Zip: 85740

<u>is:</u>

Utility Company.

Liberty Water-Bella Vista Water Company, Inc.

Division:

Water

Contact Name:

Contact Phone:

Nature of Complaint:

DOCKET NUMBERS; W-02465A-09-0411, W-02465A-09-0414, W20453A-09-0414, W-20454A-09-0414, W-20453A-09-0413, W-20454A-09-0413

REFERENCE: Liberty Water-Bella Vista Water Company, Inc.

Nancy Newman

Arizona Corporation Commission

Tucson, AZ 80/40-07.0

DOCKETED

June 18, 2010

JUN 29 2010

DOCKETED BY

RP COMMISSION CONTROL

ECEIVED

Arizona Corporation Commission Consumer Services Section 1200 West Washington Phoenix, Arizona 85007

Reference Bella Vista Water Company, Inc.

Rate Increases, TrartSfer of Assets, Consolidation of Operations BVWC, NSWC, & SSVTC

DOCKET NO. W-02465A-09-0411

DOCKET NO. W-02465A-09-0414

DOCKET NO. W-20453A-09-0414

DOCKET NO. W-20454A-09-0414

I am a Commercial Customer of Bella Vista Water Company at

It is outrageous that the above referenced water companies BVWC, NSWC, and SSWC are asking the Arizona Corporation Commission, for the proposed excessive water rate increases. As a commercial customer of BVWC, it is totally unacceptable to approach a price increase of 42.76% to 40.99% especially in

127 10

ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION

UTILITY COMPLAINT FORM

recession/depression times. Even in the best of times the increases are way too much. 3% is standard maximum increase for commercial leases- if you ran get it. Small business cannot continue to rescue poorly run companies. If the cause for the proposed increase is from increased costs, well they need to suck in their belts and suffer with the rest of us.

I firmly, as a small business commercial landlord, object to these rate increases. Small business tenants are usually nursed, especially now to keep occupancy. Landlords, property owners, and tenants can't give more, for there is none to give. These water companies must have been extremely mismanaged to ask for such extreme increases. The public cannot continue to shoulder other's mistakes. On a standalone basis, BVWC's \$6.33 (26.04%) monthly increase is too much to expect. Every penny counts in small business especially in the US today with governments wanting more, with Internet and big business competition, and in a recession/depression economy with no end insight. From where is this extra \$6.33 per month to come? Small business does not have large salaries, if any at all, plus no benefits. Where is small business to get this money???? Why such huge increases???? How much profit is in the merger on the backs of small business? I request common sense in this decision by the Arizona Corporation Commission. Even in good times \$6.33 per month is too much.

\$9.97 (40.00%) monthly increase if BVWC merges with NSWC and SSWC isn't even worth discussing. NO is the answer. Even in the best of times the amount is idiotic. For our United States to survive this recession/depression, for Arizona to attract new business, and most of all for current businesses to stay in business, the requested rate increase of the above listed companies are extreme increases NOT to be considered.

Where is the benefit for the price? We all must come together and work with what little we have so we can survive for the future. With reduced business, lower rents, and vacancies, just being able to stay afloat in the current day-to-day survival challenge is enough.

Thank you

Nancy Newman

End of Complaint

<u>Utilities' Response:</u>

N/A

End of Response

Investigator's Comments and Disposition:

Noted and filed in Docket Control.

End of Comments

Date Completed: 6/23/2010

Opinion No. 2010 - 87552